arXiv:1503.01884v3 [gr-qc] 14 Jun 2016

Null-null components of the generalized Einstein tensor for Lovelock models

Alessandro Pesci*
INFN-Bologna, Via Irnerio 46, I-40126 Bologna, Italy

For spherical symmetry, we provide expressions for the radial null-null components of the generalized Einstein tensor E_{ab} for Lovelock models for diagonal E_{ab} in terms of the metric and of the radial null-null components of the Ricci tensor. We show they can be usefully employed for example in obtaining the Birkhoff-like theorem for Lovelock models, as well as in providing a relation between the null energy and null convergence conditions for the same models.

I. INTRODUCTION

Calculations in spherically symmetric spacetimes are far easier if the metric of the spacetime under consideration has time-time component and $r-r$ component (r is areal radius) in the form $g_{tt}g_{rr}=-1$, like the Schwarzschild solution to Einstein's equations. When one deals with some metric theory of gravity, and starts cosidering first the case with as much as symmetry and simplicity as possible, one would like then for example to know whether the metric of the spherically symmetric vacuum solutions of the theory is necessarily of this form or not. A general condition for a static spherically symmetric metric to have this form has been given in [1], in terms of the vanishing of the radial null-null components of the Ricci tensor. This condition can equivalently be thought, of course, as the vanishing of the radial null-null components of the Einstein tensor.

For spherically symmetric vacuum solutions to Einstein's equations, one knows thus that the (static) metric does have the form above; this can also be viewed as a manifestation of Birkhoff's theorem [2, 3] at work. When one goes, however, to general theories of gravity, what drives the motion is no longer the Einstein tensor but the generalized Einstein tensor. For vacuum solutions, what one knows is thus the vanishing of the radial null-null components of the generalized Einstein tensor (and of the tensor itself, of course), not of these same components for Einstein or Ricci. In this context, the point at issue apparently is to know when the vanishing of those components for generalized Einstein means their vanishing for Ricci.

Here, we investigate this for Lovelock models. From the Birkhoff-like theorem for generic such models [4–6], one already knows that the metric for spherically symmetric vacuum solutions must have the form above, and thus that for these models the vanishing of the radial null-null components for generalized Einstein must imply their vanishing for Ricci. One interesting thing, however, could be to read this directly from the expression of these components for the generalized Einstein tensor. Our aim is to provide a multi-purpose expression for these components in terms of the metric, and of the same components for Ricci. From the generic vanishing of it one should directly read the vanishing of the radial null-null components of Ricci, thus obtaining the Birkhoff-like theorem. Another use of this expression, is in exploring the relation between the null energy condition (NEC) and the null convergence condition (NCC) in the radial direction for Lovelock models.

II. STATEMENT OF THE QUESTION

In D-dimensional spacetime, we consider gravitational Lagrangians L with $L=L(g^{ab},R^a{}_{bcd})$, being g^{ab} the metric and $R^a{}_{bcd}$ the Riemann tensor (latin labels span all the D coordinates, $\{x^a\}$), that is with general dependence on metric and Riemann tensor but with no dependence on derivatives of the latter. The equations of motion for the field g^{ab} we get for an action I with variation $\delta I=\int d^Dx\ \delta(\sqrt{-g}L)-\frac{1}{2}\int d^Dx\ \sqrt{-g}\ T_{ab}\ \delta g^{ab}$, are

$$2\ E_{ab}=T_{ab},\tag{1}$$

where T_{ab} is the energy-momentum tensor and

$$E_{ab}=U_{ab}-2\ \nabla^i\nabla^j P_{aijb}\tag{2}$$

---

*Electronic address: pesci@bo.infn.it

is the generalized Einstein tensor, with $U_{ab} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\partial(\sqrt{-g}L)}{\partial g^{ab}}$ and ${P_a}^{ijb} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial {R^a}_{ijb}}$ (see e.g. [7]). U_{ab} and P_{abcd} have the same symmetries in their indices as g_{ab} and R_{abcd} respectively.

Within this set of Lagrangians, we consider the subset of Lovelock Lagrangians (LL) [8–10], i.e. linear combinations of a suitable, finite number of pure Lovelock terms, each one writable as

$$L_{(m)} \equiv \frac{1}{2^m}\ \delta^{c_1 d_1 c_2 d_2 \ldots c_m d_m}_{a_1 b_1 a_2 b_2 \ldots a_m b_m}\ R^{a_1 b_1}_{c_1 d_1} R^{a_2 b_2}_{c_2 d_2} \ldots R^{a_m b_m}_{c_m d_m} = \frac{1}{m}\ P^{cd}_{ab} R^{ab}_{cd}, \tag{3}$$

where $m = 1, 2, \ldots$ is the order of the term. Here, $\delta^{c_1 d_1 c_2 d_2 \ldots c_m d_m}_{a_1 b_1 a_2 b_2 \ldots a_m b_m}$ are D-dimensional "permutation tensors" [11] of rank $2m$, and the equality comes either differentiating directly the expression for $L(m)$ or making use of Euler's theorem, being $L_{(m)}$ a homogeneous function of degree m in R^{ab}_{cd}. $L_{(1)} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\ \delta^{cd}_{ab}\ R^{ab}_{cd} = R$ is the Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian, given by the scalar curvature R. $L_{(2)} \equiv \frac{1}{4}\ \delta^{c_1 d_1 c_2 d_2}_{a_1 b_1 a_2 b_2}\ R^{a_1 b_1}_{c_1 d_1} R^{a_2 b_2}_{c_2 d_2} = R^{abcd} R_{abcd} - 4\ R^{ab} R_{ab} + R^2$ is the Gauss-Bonnet term (R_{ab} is the Ricci tensor).

For LL,

$$L = \sum_{m=1}^{[\frac{D-1}{2}]} c_m L_{(m)}, \tag{4}$$

with c_m real constants. Denoting with $U_{ab(m)}$, ${P_a}^{ijb}{}_{(m)}$ and $E_{ab(m)}$ the tensors in eq. (2) corresponding to $L_{(m)}$, in the equations of motion (1) we have $E_{ab} = \sum_{m=1}^{[\frac{D-1}{2}]} c_m E_{ab(m)}$, with

$$\begin{aligned} E_{ab(m)} &= U_{ab(m)} - 2\ \nabla^i \nabla^j P_{aijb(m)} = U_{ab(m)} = -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{ab} L_{(m)} + \frac{\partial L_{(m)}}{\partial g^{ab}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{ab} L_{(m)} + \frac{\partial L_{(m)}}{\partial R^{kl}_{ij}} \frac{\partial R^{kl}_{ij}}{\partial g^{ab}} = -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{ab} L_{(m)} + P^{ij}_{kl(m)}\ \frac{1}{2}\big(\delta^l_a {R^k}_{bij} + \delta^l_b {R^k}_{aij}\big) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{ab} L_{(m)} + \frac{1}{2}\big(P^{ij}_{ka(m)} {R^k}_{bij} + P^{ij}_{kb(m)} {R^k}_{aij}\big) = -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{ab} L_{(m)} + P^{ij}_{kb(m)} {R^k}_{aij}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the last equality follows from turning out the two terms in round brackets of l.h.s. equal [12]. These expressions are only second order in the derivatives of the metric. Essential to this, is the second equality. It is obtained thanks to the crucial property of these Lagrangians of having ${P^{abcd}}_{(m)}$ with zero divergence on each of the indices:

$$\nabla_c {P^{abcd}}_{(m)} = 0, \tag{6}$$

and the same for any other index [13]. For $m = 1$, we get

$$E_{ab(1)} = -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{ab} L_{(1)} + P^{ij}_{kb(1)} {R^k}_{aij} = -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{ab} R + \frac{1}{2} \delta^{ij}_{kb} {R^k}_{aij} = -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{ab} R + R_{ab}, \tag{7}$$

so that $E_{ab(1)}$ is the Einstein tensor, and the equations of motion $2E_{ab(1)} = T_{ab}$ are the Einstein equations (in Planck units, and without a $1/16\pi$ factor in the l.h.s.). For the pure Gauss-Bonnet term, we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_{ab(2)} &= -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{ab} L_{(2)} + P^{ij}_{kb(2)} {R^k}_{aij} = -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{ab} L_{(2)} + \frac{1}{2}\ \delta^{ijc_2 d_2}_{kba_2 b_2}\ R^{a_2 b_2}_{c_2 d_2} {R^k}_{aij} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{ab} L_{(2)} + 2\ {R^k}_{aij} R^{ij}_{kb} + 4\ R^j_k {R^k}_{abj} + 2\ R_{ab} R - 4\ R^j_a R_{bj}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The Lagrangians are chosen with cosmological constant $\Lambda = 0$. The effects of any additional term Λg_{ab} with $\Lambda \neq 0$ in the Lagrangian, can conveniently be described leaving the Lagrangian as it is, i.e. without cosmological term, and introducing, among the sources, a cosmological ideal fluid with stress-energy tensor $(T_\Lambda)_{ab} = -2\ \Lambda g_{ab}$.

Considering any null field n^a in vacuum (vac) or in vacuum with cosmological constant (cosmovac), we have $T_{ab}\ n^a n^b = 0$, and thus $E_{ab}\ n^a n^b = 0$. Considering, in particular, some piece of spacetime with spherical symmetry with l^a denoting a generic radial null vector field, this means $E_{ab}\ l^a l^b = 0$.

When $m = 1$, from (7) we see that $E_{ab(1)}\ l^a l^b = 0$ is manifestly equivalent to $R_{ab}\ l^a l^b = 0$. In the $m = 2$ case, and even more so for $m > 2$, the dependence on R^{ab}_{cd} in $E_{ab(m)}$ is more involved, so that the just mentioned equivalence is not manifest, if present at all (but we know this must actually be somehow the case from Birkhoff-like theorem for Lovelock models). Our aim is to try to work out a general expression for $E_{ab}\ l^a l^b$ in terms of the components of the metric for Lovelock models for diagonal E_{ab}, somehow generalizing what is done in certain derivations (in [7], for instance) of Birkhoff's theorem in general relativity. The idea/hope is that this expression can be put also in a form such that $E_{ab}\ l^a l^b = 0$ turns out to be, at least at certain conditions to be investigated, manifestly equivalent to $R_{ab}\ l^a l^b = 0$, and that, among other possible uses, it can be exploited to derive the Birkhoff-like theorem, as well as to explore the relation between the NEC and the NCC in the radial direction for Lovelock models.

III. CALCULATION

We are going to provide an expression for $E_{ab}\ l^a l^b$ in terms of the metric for spherically symmetric configurations. This expression turns out to be the same in the static and non-static cases, provided E_{ab} is diagonal in spherical coordinates (for a static configuration, this is the case already; for a non-static configuration, the meaning of this is to require $E_{tr} = E_{rt} = 0$). Let us consider first the static case. The general metric for a spherically symmetric, static spacetime can be written as

$$ds^2 = -A\ dt^2 + B\ dr^2 + r^2\ d\Omega^2 = -A\ dt^2 + B\ dr^2 + r^2 \sum_I h_{II}(x)\ (dx^I)^2 \tag{9}$$

where $A = A(r)$ and $B = B(r)$, being r the areal radius, and where the x^I, $I = 3, 4, ..., D$, are chosen to be the usual angular coordinates parametrising the $(D-2)$-dimensional manifold orthogonal to (t, r) in diagonal form ($d\Omega^2 = d\alpha_1^2 + \sin^2\alpha_1(d\alpha_2^2 + \sin^2\alpha_2(d\alpha_3^2 + \sin^2\alpha_3(...)))$, with $(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_{D-2}) = x^I$) and the sum over I is explicitly indicated. What we have to do, is to find an expression for $E_{ab(m)}\ l^a l^b$ in terms of r, A and B.

From (5) and from the definition of $P^{cd}_{ab(m)}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_{tt(m)} &= P^{ij}_{kt(m)} R^k{}_{tij} - \frac{1}{2} g_{tt} L_{(m)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m}\ g_{tt}\ \Big(m\ \delta^{ijc_2d_2...c_md_m}_{kta_2b_2...a_mb_m}\ R^{kt}_{ij} R^{a_2b_2}_{c_2d_2} ... R^{a_mb_m}_{c_md_m} - \frac{1}{2}\delta^{c_1d_1c_2d_2...c_md_m}_{a_1b_1a_2b_2...a_mb_m}\ R^{a_1b_1}_{c_1d_1} R^{a_2b_2}_{c_2d_2} ... R^{a_mb_m}_{c_md_m}\Big) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m}\ g_{tt}\ \Big(-\frac{1}{2}\delta^{c_1d_1c_2d_2...c_md_m(\not t)}_{a_1b_1a_2b_2...a_mb_m(\not t)}\ R^{a_1b_1}_{c_1d_1} R^{a_2b_2}_{c_2d_2} ... R^{a_mb_m}_{c_md_m}\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

with $\not i$ meaning the index i cannot be present in the string. For the metric (9), the only non-vanishing components of the Riemann tensor are $R^{t\alpha}_{t\alpha}$, $R^{r\alpha}_{r\alpha}$ and $R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta}$ ($\alpha \neq \beta$) (and those related to these by symmetries), and they do not depend on α and β. Here and in what follows, Greek indices denote specific angular components and no convention on sum of repeated indices is assumed for them. From this and the symmetries of Riemann, we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_{tt(m)} &= \frac{1}{2}\ g_{tt}\ \frac{1}{2^m}\ \Big(-m\ 2^{m+1} \sum_{\alpha,\alpha_2,\beta_2,...,\alpha_m,\beta_m \neq} R^{r\alpha}_{r\alpha} R^{\alpha_2\beta_2}_{\alpha_2\beta_2} ... R^{\alpha_m\beta_m}_{\alpha_m\beta_m} - 2^m \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha_2,\beta_2,...,\alpha_m,\beta_m \neq} R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta} R^{\alpha_2\beta_2}_{\alpha_2\beta_2} ... R^{\alpha_m\beta_m}_{\alpha_m\beta_m}\Big) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\ g_{tt}\ \Big[-m\ 2(D-2)(D-3)...(D-2m)\ R^{r\alpha}_{r\alpha}\big(R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta}\big)^{m-1} - (D-2)(D-3)...(D-2m-1)\big(R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta}\big)^m\Big] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\ g_{tt}\ (D-2)!\ \frac{1}{(D-2m-1)!}\ \big(R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta}\big)^{m-1}\ \Big[-2m\ R^{r\alpha}_{r\alpha} - (D-2m-1)\ R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta}\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The '$\neq$' symbol in the sums means that the sums are taken with all indices different. Analogous calculations give

$$E_{rr(m)} = \frac{1}{2}\ g_{rr}\ (D-2)!\ \frac{1}{(D-2m-1)!}\ \big(R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta}\big)^{m-1}\ \Big[-2m\ R^{t\alpha}_{t\alpha} - (D-2m-1)\ R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta}\Big] \tag{12}$$

and $E_{rt(m)} = 0$.

Defining

$$Q[X] := \sum_{m=1}^{[\frac{D-1}{2}]} \frac{m\ c_m}{(D-2m-1)!}\ X^{m-1} \tag{13}$$

and

$$W[X] := \sum_{m=1}^{[\frac{D-1}{2}]} \frac{c_m}{(D-2m-1)!}\ X^{m} = \int_0^X Q[\tilde{X}]\ d\tilde{X}, \tag{14}$$

$\frac{dW}{dX} = Q$, polynomials in

$$X \ = \ R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta}(\alpha \neq \beta) \ = \ \frac{1}{r^2}\ \Big(1 - \frac{1}{B}\Big), \tag{15}$$

equations (11) and (12) give

$$E_{tt} = \frac{1}{2}\ g_{tt}\ (D-2)!\ \Big\{2\ \big(-R^{r\alpha}_{r\alpha} + X\big)\ Q[X] - (D-1)\ W[X]\Big\} \tag{16}$$

$$E_{rr} = \frac{1}{2}\ g_{rr}\ (D-2)!\ \Big\{2\ \big(-R^{t\alpha}_{t\alpha} + X\big)\ Q[X] - (D-1)\ W[X]\Big\}. \tag{17}$$

From these and $E_{rt} = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_{ab}\ l^a l^b \ &= \ \mu^2\ (D-2)!\ Q[X]\ \Big[-g_{tt}g_{rr}\ \big(R^{r\alpha}_{r\alpha} - R^{t\alpha}_{t\alpha}\big)\Big] \\ &= \ \mu^2\ (D-2)!\ Q[X]\ \frac{1}{2rB}(AB)', \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where l^a, with

$$l^t = \mu\ \sqrt{g_{rr}},\ l^r = \pm\mu\ \sqrt{-g_{tt}},\ l^\alpha = 0, \tag{19}$$

μ a function, is generic radial null. In the derivation of (18), use has been made of the explicit expressions $g_{tt} = -A$, $g_{rr} = B$, $R^{t\alpha}_{t\alpha} = -\frac{1}{2rB}\ \frac{A'}{A}$, and $R^{r\alpha}_{r\alpha} = \frac{1}{2rB}\ \frac{B'}{B}$, with the prime denoting differentiation with respect to r.

This is the expression for $E_{ab}\ l^a l^b$ we obtain assuming the configuration is static. In the non-static case, i.e. assuming $A = A(t,r)$ and $B = B(t,r)$ in (9), some of the expressions for the components of Riemann tensor change with respect to the static case (due to $\dot{A} \neq 0$ and $\dot{B} \neq 0$, where the dot denotes differentiation with respect to t), producing also some components which are no longer vanishing. These latter are the $R^{r\alpha}_{t\alpha} = \frac{1}{2rB}\ \frac{\dot{B}}{B}$ and those related to these by symmetries. In the calculations of $E_{tt(m)}$, $E_{rr(m)}$, $E_{rt(m)}$ above, the effect of these no-longer-vanishing components is to give place to additional terms. As for $E_{rt(m)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{rt(m)} \ &= \ -\frac{1}{2}g_{rt}L_{(m)} + P^{ij}_{kt(m)}R^{k}{}_{rij} = P^{ij}_{kt(m)}R^{k}{}_{rij} \\ &= \ g_{rr}\ \frac{m}{2^m}\ \delta^{ijc_2d_2\dots c_md_m}_{kta_2b_2\dots a_mb_m}\ R^{kr}_{ij}R^{a_2b_2}_{c_2d_2}\dots R^{a_mb_m}_{c_md_m} \\ &= \ g_{rr}\ \frac{m}{2^m}\ \sum_\alpha \delta^{ijc_2d_2\dots c_md_m}_{\alpha ta_2b_2\dots a_mb_m}\ R^{\alpha r}_{ij}R^{a_2b_2}_{c_2d_2}\dots R^{a_mb_m}_{c_md_m} \\ &= \ g_{rr}\ \frac{m}{2^m}\ \Big(2^3\sum_{\alpha,\beta}\delta^{\alpha r\beta tc_3d_3\dots c_md_m}_{\alpha t\beta ra_3b_3\dots a_mb_m}\ R^{\alpha r}_{\alpha r}R^{\beta r}_{\beta t}R^{a_3b_3}_{c_3d_3}\dots R^{a_mb_m}_{c_md_m} + 2^3\sum_{\alpha,\beta}\delta^{\alpha t\beta rc_3d_3\dots c_md_m}_{\alpha t\beta ra_3b_3\dots a_mb_m}\ R^{\alpha r}_{\alpha t}R^{\beta r}_{\beta r}R^{a_3b_3}_{c_3d_3}\dots R^{a_mb_m}_{c_md_m} \\ &\quad + 2^m \sum_{\alpha,\alpha_2,\beta_2,\dots,\alpha_m,\beta_m \neq} R^{\alpha r}_{\alpha t}R^{\alpha_2\beta_2}_{\alpha_2\beta_2}\dots R^{\alpha_m\beta_m}_{\alpha_m\beta_m}\Big) \\ &= \ g_{rr}\ m \sum_{\alpha,\alpha_2,\beta_2,\dots,\alpha_m,\beta_m \neq} R^{\alpha r}_{\alpha t}R^{\alpha_2\beta_2}_{\alpha_2\beta_2}\dots R^{\alpha_m\beta_m}_{\alpha_m\beta_m} \\ &= \ g_{rr}\ (D-2)!\ R^{r\alpha}_{t\alpha}\ \frac{m}{(D-2m-1)!}\ X^{m-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

with $X = R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta}$ given by the same expression (15) also for the non-static configuration. This gives

$$E_{rt} = g_{rr}\ (D-2)!\ R^{r\alpha}_{t\alpha}\ Q[X] = (D-2)!\ Q[X]\ \frac{1}{2rB}\ \dot{B}. \tag{21}$$

From this expression, we have that when, in the spherical coordinates we consider, E_{ab} is diagonal, as in vac or cosmovac solutions, from $E_{rt} = 0$ it follows $Q[X] = 0$ or $\dot{B} = 0$. This means $\dot{B} = 0$ (since the $B = \frac{1}{1-\hat{X}r^2}$ from any $\hat{X}$ with $Q[\hat{X}] = 0$ is non-depending on t) and then $R^{r\alpha}_{t\alpha} = 0$, even if the configuration we are considering is actually not static. Thus, for diagonal E_{ab}, the expressions (16-17) remain unchanged when going to the non-static case. Now, in addition to $R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta}$ also the explicit expressions for $R^{t\alpha}_{t\alpha}$, $R^{r\alpha}_{r\alpha}$ are left unchanged by any $\dot{A} \neq 0$ (and $\dot{B} \neq 0$). The final expression of $E_{ab}\ l^a l^b$ in the non-static case is, then, still equation (18) with $A = A(t,r)$ and $B = B(r)$.

We can give equation (18) a slightly different form. E_{ab} diagonal, implying $R^{r\alpha}_{t\alpha} = 0$, gives $R^r_t = 0$. We have then

$$\begin{aligned} R_{ab}\ l^a l^b &= R_{tt}\ l^t l^t + R_{rr}\ l^r l^r \\ &= \mu^2\ (-g_{tt} g_{rr})\ (R^r_r - R^t_t) \\ &= \mu^2\ (-g_{tt} g_{rr})\ (D-2)\ (R^{r\alpha}_{r\alpha} - R^{t\alpha}_{t\alpha}) \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

and, from the first equality in (18),

$$E_{ab}\ l^a l^b = (D-3)!\ Q[X]\ R_{ab}\ l^a l^b, \tag{23}$$

with $X = X(r)$ both in the static and non-static case. The polynomial $Q[X]$, being from (23) the ratio of two scalar quantities, is itself a scalar. Looking at its definition (13), it can be thougth as invariantly constructed from its argument X, which is (eq. (15)) $R^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha\beta} (\alpha \neq \beta)$ in the coordinates (9), meant as a scalar. Also the polynomial $W[X]$, as well as any polynomial in the scalar X, is thus invariant.

The results (18) and (23) turn out to be entangled with the results [5]. Q coincides with the quantity denoted as P' in [5] regarding the dependence on their respective arguments (see eq. (22) there). Upon re-transforming back from the coordinates (u,v) used in [5], in terms of which the squared distance (9) is $ds^2 = 2\ \mathrm{e}^{2\nu(u,v)}\ dudv + \mathcal{B}^2(u,v)\ d\Omega^2$, to the coordinates (t,r) used here, the argument Z of P', written there in the case of spherical symmetry as $Z = \frac{1\ -\ 2(\partial_u \mathcal{B})(\partial_v \mathcal{B})\mathrm{e}^{-2\nu}}{\mathcal{B}^2}$ is $Z = \frac{1}{r^2}(1 - \frac{1}{g_{rr}}) = X$, since $r = \mathcal{B}$ and $g_{rr} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{2\nu}}{(\partial_u \mathcal{B})(\partial_v \mathcal{B})}$. Z is thus that same scalar X given in (15) and $P'\left[\frac{1\ -\ 2(\partial_u \mathcal{B})(\partial_v \mathcal{B})\mathrm{e}^{-2\nu}}{\mathcal{B}^2}\right]$ *is* actually the invariant polynomial $Q[X]$ [17].

Let us consider, as a first use of equations (18) or (23), vac and cosmovac. From $E_{ab}\ l^a l^b = 0$ in this case, we get (a) $(AB)' = 0$ or (b) $Q[X] = 0$, A generic. From (13), case b can only happen when at least one of the constants c_m with $m > 1$ is non-vanishing. From the coincidence between $P'[Z]$ in [5] and $Q[X]$ here, this case is that already considered as $P'[Z] = 0$ solutions (class I solutions) in [5], and a general discussion of their properties is given in [18], [19]. In our framework, we can notice the following. In case b, from (16)-(17) we have

$$E^{(b)}_{tt} = -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{tt}\ (D-1)!\ W[\hat{X}], \tag{24}$$

$$E^{(b)}_{rr} = -\frac{1}{2}\ g_{rr}\ (D-1)!\ W[\hat{X}], \tag{25}$$

for any $\hat{X}$ with $Q[\hat{X}] = 0$. As for $E_{\alpha\alpha}$, the same algebra which leads to (11)-(12) and (16)-(17) gives

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\alpha\alpha} = \frac{1}{2}\ g_{\alpha\alpha}\ (D-3)!\ \Big\{ & 2\ \big[-R^{tr}_{tr} - (D-3)\big(R^{t\beta}_{t\beta} + R^{r\beta}_{r\beta}\big) + (2D-5)X \big]\ Q[X] \\ & -(D-1)(D-2)\ W[X] - 4\ \big(X - R^{r\beta}_{r\beta}\big)\big(X - R^{t\beta}_{t\beta}\big)\ Y[X] \Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

having defined the invariant polynomial

$$Y[X] := \sum_{m=1}^{[\frac{D-1}{2}]} \frac{m\ (m-1)\ c_m}{(D-2m-1)!}\ X^{m-2} = \frac{dQ}{dX} = \frac{d^2 W}{dX^2}. \tag{27}$$

In case b, this implies

$$E^{(b)}_{\alpha\alpha} = -\frac{1}{2}\; g_{\alpha\alpha}\; (D-1)!\; W[\hat{X}], \tag{28}$$

since $Q[\hat{X}] = 0$, and when $B = \frac{1}{1-\hat{X}r^2}$ (from any $\hat{X}$ with $Q[\hat{X}] = 0$), $R^{r\beta}_{r\beta} = \hat{X}$.

From (24, 25, 28), in case b all what the equations of motion require is $W[\hat{X}] = 0$ for vac, and $W[\hat{X}] = \frac{2\Lambda}{(D-1)!}$ for cosmovac. A solution, if any, has thus A generic. At the same time, the Ricci scalar $R = \frac{1}{2}\delta^{cd}_{ab} R^{ab}_{cd}$ depends on A and its first and second derivatives and is generically non-vanishing. This means that different A's generically give spacetimes with different curvature scalars, and thus with genuinely different geometries, i.e. geometries not recoverable each from the other through coordinate trasformations. In case b we have thus the peculiar circumstances that the solutions for vac or cosmovac, when they can exist, are under-determined by the equations of motion.

Case a gives $AB = \text{const}$, that is $AB = f(t)$, with $A = A(t,r)$, $B = B(r)$ and f a function of t alone. The metric we have is $ds^2 = -\frac{f(t)}{B(r)}dt^2 + B(r)dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2$. Changing the t-coordinate to $\tilde{t}$ with $d\tilde{t} = \sqrt{f}\; dt$, we get $ds^2 = -\frac{1}{B(r)}dt^2 + B(r)dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2$, thus reducing to $AB = 1$ with $A = A(r)$ and $B = B(r)$, both in the static and non-static cases. A sensible notion of mass M of gravitating body can then be given, in the form of a generalised Misner-Sharp mass [20] defined in terms of $B(r)$ [19, 21, 22], and the solutions are parameterized in terms of M.

Summing up, in deriving expressions (18) and (23), and considering, as a first example of their use, vac and cosmovac configurations, we have thus shown the following:

Proposition 1. Consider a Lovelock model and a region with spherically symmetric geometry. If the generalized Einstein tensor E_{ab} turns out to be diagonal in the spherical coordinates, then its two radial null-null components $E_{ab}\; l^a l^b$ (which are equal) can be expressed according to formulae (18) and (23).

Proposition 2. Consider a Lovelock model and a region with spherically symmetric geometry. Any vac or cosmovac solution to the equations of motion under non-exceptional conditions (meaning the equations of motion are able to fix the solutions), can be expressed in the form $ds^2 = -\frac{1}{B(r)}dt^2 + B(r)dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2$, That is, Birkhoff-like theorem for Lovelock models.

Another example of use of (18) or (23) can be envisaged as follows. For diagonal, otherwise generic T_{ab} (and thus, in particular, for any ideal fluid), from (1) and (23) we get on-shell

$$T_{ab}\; l^a l^b = 2\; (D-3)!\; Q[X]\; R_{ab}\; l^a l^b; \tag{29}$$

thus, in particular,

$$\operatorname{sgn}(T_{ab}\; l^a l^b) = \operatorname{sgn}(Q[X])\; \operatorname{sgn}(R_{ab}\; l^a l^b), \tag{30}$$

with X evaluated for solutions to the equations of motion. The NEC and the NCC ($T_{ab}\; n^a n^b \geq 0$ and $R_{ab}\; n^a n^b \geq 0$ respectively, at any point, $\forall n^a$ null) in the radial direction are in general not equivalent in Lovelock models, and equations (29, 30) trace this fact at any point of our symmetric spacetime in terms of the invariant polynomial $Q[X]$, which becomes then a tool to study their relationship in an invariant manner [23]. The two conditions become equivalent whenever $Q[X] > 0$. In particular, the NEC and the NCC are equivalent in general relativity ($Q[X] = \frac{1}{(D-3)!}$ for it).

As long as we regard the NEC and the NCC as equivalent expressions of some fundamental input required on physical grounds [25], extending however the scope of this beyond general relativity to include any metric theory of gravity, the condition on the sign of $Q[X]$ sounds as a physical constraint on viable Lovelock models and/or on viability of some specific solutions to the equations of motion for them. Namely, given any solution to the equations of motion for some Lovelock model, the choice made of the constants c_m entering the Lagrangian (4), which defines the model under consideration, and the specific solution considered should guarantee that the invariant polynomial $Q[X]$ in (13) gives $Q[X] > 0$ at any point of spacetime, when X is evaluated on the solution [26].

This extending of the NCC and of its equivalence with the NEC beyond general relativity could turn out to be not so ventured after all. In view of (D-dimensional) Raychaudhuri equation which applies equally regardless of the model, the physical input underlying it would be to maintain that 'any source matter obeys the NEC' and that this is 'its gravity acts always focusing' in disguise.

Also, we can look at this from thermodynamics (for thermodynamics of Lovelock gravity we refer to [28] and references therein). Indeed, $Q[X]$ can be given on-shell the interpretation of ratio of two (horizon) entropies, and as such it turns out to be quite natural to require it to be positive.

In the l.h.s. of (29) appears, in fact, something which gives the Wald entropy S_W of horizon for the gravity model under consideration. More precisely, let us consider the local frame $\{x^a\}$ of the element of matter at P. Given a generic null vector n^a, we choose the local frame such that n^a be given by $n^0 = 1$, $n^1 = 1$, with the other components vanishing, and $x^0(P) = 0$. Consider an accelerating observer along x^1 with acceleration κ, instantaneously coinciding and at rest with respect to the element of matter at the time $x^0 = 0$, and choose the origin of the x^1-axis such that $x^1(P) = \frac{1}{\kappa}$ (let us call it the accelerating frame along n^a of (i.e. associated to) the element of matter). The Rindler horizon perceived by the accelerating observer is at $x^0 \pm x^1 = 0$, and has, as tangent vector field to the generators, the field obtained parallel-transporting k^a in the local Lorentz frame $\{x^a\}$. When the element of matter gets absorbed by the horizon, the (semiclassical) variation dS_W of horizon entropy in the gravity theory under consideration is (cf. [29])

$$\begin{aligned} dS_W(P, n^a) &= \frac{1}{T_H} \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} T_{ab}\ \xi^a_{(t_R)} n^b A\ d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{T_H} T_{ab}\ n^a n^b\ dV_{prop}, \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where $\lambda = x^1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}$ is affine parameter, $T_H = \frac{\kappa}{2\pi}$ is the temperature of the horizon, $\xi^a_{(t_R)}$ is the Killing vector field corresponding to translations in Rindler time t_R, dV_{prop} is the proper volume of the element of matter with L proper thickness, and use of the limit $\xi^a_{(t_R)} \to \kappa x^1 n^a$ on the horizon is made.

As for the r.h.s., by the same token we get that the quantity $\frac{1}{T_H}(2\ R_{ab}\ n^a n^b)\ dV_{prop}$ is the variation of the entropy of that same horizon but for Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian, and thus is the variation of Bekenstein-Hawking entropy $dS_{BH}(P, n^a)$, provided that we consider now that same metric configuration as solution to the equations of motion of Einstein-Hilbert instead of general Lovelock. Indeed, for $L = L_{(1)}$ in (4), (1) becomes $2R_{ab} - g_{ab}R = T_{ab}$. Checking this directly:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T_H}\ (2R_{ab}\ n^a n^b)\ dV_{prop} &= \frac{1}{T_H}\ 2 \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} R_{ab}\ \xi^a_{(t_R)} n^b A\ d\lambda \\ &= 4\pi A \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} R_{ab}\ n^a n^b\ \Big(\lambda + \frac{1}{\kappa}\Big)\ d\lambda \\ &= 4\pi A \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} \Big(-\frac{d\theta}{d\lambda}\Big)\ \Big(\lambda + \frac{1}{\kappa}\Big)\ d\lambda \\ &= 4\pi A \left\{ \Big[-\theta\ \ \Big(\lambda + \frac{1}{\kappa}\Big)\Big]_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} + \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} \theta\ d\lambda \right\} \\ &= 4\pi A \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} \theta\ d\lambda \\ &= 4\pi A\ \frac{dA}{A} \\ &= 4\pi\ dA = dS_{BH}(P, n^a) \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

(with the normalization $L = \frac{1}{16\pi} R = \frac{1}{16\pi} L_{(1)}$, we get $\frac{1}{16\pi}(2R_{ab} - g_{ab}R) = T_{ab}$ and $\frac{1}{16\pi}\frac{1}{T_H}(2R_{ab}\ n^a n^b)\ dV_{prop} = \frac{dA}{4}$), where $\theta = \frac{d \ln A}{d\lambda}$ is the expansion of the null congruence generating the horizon. Here, use has been made of $\theta\big(-\frac{L}{2}\big) = 0 = \theta\big(\frac{L}{2}\big)$ to express initial and final stationarity of the horizon, and of the approximation $\frac{d\theta}{d\lambda} = -R_{ab}\ n^a n^b$ for θ small.

We can thus recast (29) in the form

$$dS_W(P, l^a) = (D-3)!\ Q[X]\ dS_{BH}(P, l^a) \tag{33}$$

or

$$Q[X] = \frac{1}{(D-3)!}\ \frac{dS_W(P, l^a)}{dS_{BH}(P, l^a)}. \tag{34}$$

This shows that the invariant polynomial $Q[X]$ has also the following thermodynamical meaning: Considering some spherically symmetric configuration, solution to the equation of motions of some Lovelock gravity model, and an accelerating frame relative to matter along the radial direction with some element of matter getting absorbed by the Rindler horizon, $Q[X]$ is $\big(\frac{1}{(D-3)!}$ times$\big)$ the ratio of the entropy variation of the horizon in the Lovelock gravity model under consideration to the variation of Bekenstein-Hawking entropy one would obtain when considering the same configuration as solution of Einstein's equations.

In this perspective, the physical input underlying the extending of the NCC and of its equivalence with the NEC beyond general relativity could be imagined as follows: Any particle which gets absorbed by a Rindler horizon gives a positive (semiclassical) variation of the entropy of the horizon, whichever is the gravity metric theory actually chosen by Nature, theory which prescribes the way to assign entropy to the horizon. On this basis, the invariant polynomial $Q[X](P)$ could turn out to be the form that a much more general quantity $q(P, n^a)$ takes when evaluated for Lovelock theories and in the radial direction of spherical-symmetry configurations, being $q(P, n^a)$ defined as

$$q(P, n^a) := \frac{1}{(D-3)!} \, \frac{dS_W(P, n^a)}{dS_{BH}(P, n^a)} \tag{35}$$

in any diff-invariant theory of gravity, for any absorption process at P by a Rindler horizon with whichever tangent vector n^a to the horizon generators, and for generic configurations.

IV. COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

We have provided, in equations (18) and (23), expressions for the radial null-null components $E_{ab}\, l^a l^b$ of generalized Einstein tensor for Lovelock models for diagonal E_{ab}. And shown they can be used in deriving the Birkhoff-like theorem for 'generic' such models, as well as in discriminating among the models and/or among specific solutions to them in terms of the physical input provided by the null energy and null convergence conditions.

The validity of Birkhoff-like theorem means that any spherically symmetric vac or cosmovac solution to a generic Lovelock model is static, and its metric can be put in the form $g_{tt} g_{rr} = -1$. A general condition, given in [1], for a sperically symmetric static metric to have this form, is as mentioned the vanishing of the radial null-null components of Ricci tensor $R_{ab}\, l^a l^b$. We expect thus that, for spherically symmetric vac or cosmovac solutions to generic Lovelock, $R_{ab}\, l^a l^b = 0$. And this is precisely what happens, since, from expression (23), $E_{ab}\, l^a l^b$ vanishes when $R_{ab}\, l^a l^b$ vanishes.

In the approach we have described, the validity of Birkhoff-like theorem is read in the expression for $E_{ab}\, l^a l^b$: in that $B = B(r)$ and in that the vanishing of $E_{ab}\, l^a l^b$ means $(AB)' = 0$. Even a 'minimal' departure from LL gives troubles. Taking , for example, $\tilde{L} = f(R) = R^2$, thus restricting consideration to the effects of this particular element of the Gauss-Bonnet term alone, we have $\tilde{L} = \frac{1}{2}\, \delta^{cd}_{ab} R\, R^{ab}_{cd} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \tilde{L}}{\partial R^{ab}_{cd}}\, R^{ab}_{cd} = \frac{1}{2} P^{cd}_{ab}\, R^{ab}_{cd}$, being $\frac{\partial \tilde{L}}{\partial R^{ab}_{cd}} = \delta^{cd}_{ab} R$. $\tilde{L}$ is in the form $\tilde{L} = Q^{cd}_{ab} R^{ab}_{cd}$ with Q^{cd}_{ab} still being polynomial (linear indeed) in the components of Riemann and having the same symmetries of Riemann as in LL eq. (3); the only change is the relaxing of the condition (6) on the divergence of Q^{abcd}. The expression for $\tilde{E}_{ab}\, l^a l^b$ one obtains following the lines here, replacing eq. (18), contains indeed 4-th order derivatives of the metric, analogously to what happens for the equations of motion (an account of Birkhoff-like theorems in $f(R)$ theories can be found in [30]; an investigation of the conditions which theories with equations of motion of order larger than 2 in the derivatives of the metric should obey for Birkhoff-like theorem to hold, is in [31, 32]).

---

[1] T. Jacobson, "When is $g_{tt} g_{rr} = -1$?", Class. Quantum Grav. **24** (2007) 5717, arXiv:0707.3222.

[2] J.T. Jebsen, Arkiv för Matematik, Astronomi och Fysik **15** nr. 18 (1921) 1. Reprinted as a Golden Oldie: "On the general spherically symmetric solutions of Einstein's gravitational equations in vacuo", Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **37** nr. 12 (2005) 2253.

[3] G.D. Birkhoff, *Relativity and modern physics* (Harvard Univ. Pr., Cambridge MA, 1923).

[4] C. Charmousis, J.-F. Dufaux, "General Gauss-Bonnet brane cosmology", Class. Quantum Grav. **19** (2002) 4671, hep-th/0202107.

[5] R. Zegers, "Birkhoff's theorem in Lovelock gravity", J. Math. Phys. **46** (2005) 072502, gr-qc/0505016.

[6] S. Deser and J. Franklin, "Birkhoff for Lovelock redux", Class. Quantum Grav. **22** (2005) L103, gr-qc/0506014.

[7] T. Padmanabhan, *Gravitation: Foundations and frontiers* (Cambridge Univ. Pr., Cambridge UK, 2010).

[8] C. Lanczos, "Electricity as a natural property of Riemannian geometry", Rev. Mod. Phys. **39** (1932) 716.

[9] C. Lanczos, "A remarkable property of the Riemann-Christoffel tensor in four dimensions", Annals Math. **39** (1938) 842.

[10] D. Lovelock, “The Einstein tensor and its generalizations”, J. Math. Phys. **12** (1971) 498.

[11] C.W. Misner, K.S. Thorne and J.A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W.H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1973).

[12] T. Padmanabhan, “Some aspects of field equations in generalized theories of gravity”, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 124041, arXiv:1109.3846.

[13] The equations of motion are quasi-linear differential equations. Requiring this, is what singles out the Lovelock terms uniquely. Equivalently, one requires the generalized Einstein tensor is coming from a 4th rank tensor homogeneous in the components of Riemann, the trace of the Bianchi derivative of which be divergence-free [14–16].

[14] N. Dadhich, “Characterization of the Lovelock gravity by Bianchi derivative”, Pramana **74** (2010) 875, arXiv:0802.3034.

[15] D. Kastor, “The Riemann-Lovelock curvature tensor”, Class. Quantum Grav. **29** (2012) 155007, arXiv:1202.5287.

[16] X.O. Camanho, N. Dadhich, “On Lovelock analogues of the Riemann tensor”, arXiv:1503.02889.

[17] Equations (20) and (21) of [5] turn out to be strongly tied to equations (18) or (23) here. Writing eqs. (20) and (21) of [5] as $U = 0$ and $V = 0$ (thus with $U = P'[Z]\ [\partial_u^2\mathcal{B} - 2(\partial_u\mathcal{B})(\partial_u\nu)]$ and $V = P'[Z]\ [\partial_v^2\mathcal{B} - 2(\partial_v\mathcal{B})(\partial_v\nu)]$), we find $2rE_{ab}\ l^a l^b = -\mu^2\ (D-2)!\ A\left[\frac{1}{(\partial_u\mathcal{B})^2}U + \frac{1}{(\partial_v\mathcal{B})^2}V\right] = -(D-2)!\ [(l_+^u)^2\ U + (l_-^v)^2\ V]$, with l_+^a (l_-^a) the radial null vectors with sign + (−) in (19) above, with components $l_+^u = \mu\ \frac{1}{\partial_u\mathcal{B}}\sqrt{A}$, $l_+^v = 0$, $l_+^\alpha = 0$ ($l_-^u = 0$, $l_-^v = -\mu\ \frac{1}{\partial_v\mathcal{B}}\sqrt{A}$, $l_-^\alpha = 0$) in (u, v) coordinates.

[18] X.O. Camanho, J.D. Edelstein, “A Lovelock black hole bestiary”, Class. Quantum Grav. **30** (2013) 035009, arXiv:1103.3669.

[19] H. Maeda, S. Willison and S. Ray, “Lovelock black holes with maximally symmetric horizons”, Class. Quantum Grav. **28** (2011) 165005, arXiv:1103.4184.

[20] C.W. Misner and D.H. Sharp, “Relativistic equations for adiabatic, spherically symmetric gravitational collapse”, Phys. Rev. **136** (1964) B571.

[21] H. Maeda, M. Nozawa, “Generalized Misner-Sharp quasi-local mass in Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet gravity”, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 064031, arXiv:0709.1199.

[22] G. Kunstatter, T. Taves, H. Maeda, “Geometrodynamics of spherically symmetric Lovelock gravity”, Class. Quantum Grav. **29** (2012) 092001, arXiv:1201.4904.

[23] For the case of Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet gravity, a formula aiming too at relating NEC and NCC in the radial direction has been given in [24] eq. (3.14).

[24] M. Nozawa, H. Maeda, “Dynamical black holes with symmetry in Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet gravity”, Class. Quantum Grav. **25** (2008) 055009, arXiv:0710.2709.

[25] M. Parikh, “Two roads to the null energy condition”, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **24** (2015) 1544030, arXiv:1512.03448.

[26] Evidently, this is a strong requirement which would have impact on causality issues, acting in the sense of helping to prevent causality violations do arise. See [27], for a way of getting rid of causality violations in Gauss-Bonnet gravity (shown there to appear on very general grounds) without any extra requirement, somehow unavoidably resorting to certain additional degrees of freedom, which turn out to be precisely those expected on string theoretical grounds.

[27] X.O. Camanho, J.D. Edelstein, J. Maldacena, A. Zhiboedov, “Causality constraints on corrections to the graviton three-point coupling”, JHEP **1602** (2016) 020, arXiv:1407.5597.

[28] S. Chakraborty, “Lanczos-Lovelock gravity from a thermodynamic perspective”, JHEP **1508** (2015) 029, arXiv:1505.07272.

[29] A. Pesci, “Entropy bounds and field equations”, Entropy **17** (2015) 5799, arXiv:1404.7631.

[30] A.M. Nzioki, R. Goswami, P.K.S. Dunsby, “Jebsen-Birkhoff theorem and its stability in f(R) gravity”, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 064050, arXiv:1312.6790

[31] J. Oliva, S. Ray, “Birkhoff’s theorem in higher derivative theories of gravity” Class. Quantum Grav. **28** (2011) 175007, arXiv:1104.1205.

[32] J. Oliva, S. Ray, “Birkhoff’s Theorem in Higher Derivative Theories of Gravity II: Asymptotically Lifshitz Black Holes”, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 084014, arXiv:1201.5601.